

Worksheet

Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
NEPA #: AZ-420-2005-033

Note: This worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum titled “Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy” transmitting this worksheet and the “Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet” located at the end of the worksheet. (Note: The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM’s internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.)

A. BLM Office: Tucson Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.

Proposed Action Title/Type: Implementation of designated transportation system on Las Cienegas NCA including conversion of motorized routes to non-motorized trails and implementation of administrative use only routes.

Location of Proposed Action:

Empire Ranch, Springwater Canyon, and The Narrows USGS 1:24,000 quads. Specific routes are shown on Map 4 in the Las Cienegas RMP/ROD within T18S R17E; T19S R16E, R17E and R18E; T20S R16E, R17E and R18E; and T21S R18E.

Description of the Proposed Action:

Up to 6.6 miles of roads crossing public lands in Las Cienegas NCA will be converted from roads to non-motorized trails. Up to 28.7 miles of roads currently open to public travel will be signed and/or gated for administrative access only. These administrative use only roads will generally remain open to non-motorized travel. These actions implement plan decisions TA05 and TA06 in the Las Cienegas RMP/ROD. The road projects are shown on Map 4 in the RMP/ROD. Projects will be scheduled throughout Fiscal Years (FY) 2005 – FY 2008. Methods of conversion will include as needed ripping and/or vertical mulching of one side of the road bed; seeding or planting of native grass plugs or live plants on one-side of the road bed; and riparian plantings including pole plantings (at riparian sites). The projects will also include installation of non-motorized and administrative use only signs, and installation of barriers across existing roadways as needed, including gates and associated walk-throughs. Some projects may require installation of short sections of barbed wire or pipe-rail fence, and/or placement of boulders, posts with cable or metal post barricades and fencing tied into natural barriers or existing fencing. All work will occur within the existing road beds with the exception of these barriers which may extend beyond the existing road bed. The work will be completed by BLM assisted by volunteers or with contract labor.

Applicant (if any): None

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name* Approved Las Cienegas RMP/ROD Date Approved July 25, 2003

LUP Name* _____ Date Approved _____

Other document** _____ Date Approved _____

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

- ☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Excerpt from Approved Las Cienegas RMP/ROD July 2003 Page 16:

Limit both motorized and mechanized vehicles to designated roads and trails on the 49,000 acres of public land according to the designated transportation system (See Map 4). (TA01)

BLM makes the following route designations on public lands to implement the off-highway vehicle designation of Limited to Designated Roads (See Map 4):

- *91.9 miles are open for motorized travel by the public. (TA02)*
- *0.4 miles of new road will be constructed as a bypass at the Empire Ranch Headquarters. (TA03)*
- *0.7 mile are open for motorized travel by the public seasonally. (TA04)*
- *28.7 miles are designated for administrative use only. (TA05)*
- *6.6 miles will be converted to non-motorized trail for travel by foot, horseback or mechanized (non-motorized) vehicles including bicycles. (TA06)*
- *13.7 miles will be closed and rehabilitated. (TA07)*

Roads designated for administrative use only may be opened temporarily for public use if needed to provide alternate access. This may occur if a route designated open for public use has to be closed temporarily for resource or public safety concerns. (TA08)

Note: The locations of the road segments to be converted to non-motorized trails are shown on Map 4 in the LCRMP/ROD

- ☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.
Proposed Las Cienegas RMP/Final Environmental Impact Statement, 2002

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

Biological Opinion on the Proposed Las Cienegas RMP/Final Environmental Impact Statement, 2002

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, this activity was prescribed and analyzed in the Las Cienegas RMP/ROD 2003

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the EIS for the Las Cienegas RMP/ROD is appropriate and includes the analysis of the no action alternative which would be to leave the road segments open and not change them to non-motorized use only.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, TFO recently performed extensive review and analysis of the project area in the recently completed EIS for the Las Cienegas RMP (2002). The Biological Opinion issued for the Las Cienegas RMP also covers this type of project. No new species have been listed in the project area and new monitoring data that has been collected since the RMP was completed does not impact the existing analysis of the proposed action.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the analysis methods used in the EIS are appropriate for this proposed action. In addition, the proposed action has been reviewed by the Tucson Field Office NEPA review team for consistency.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the EIS sufficiently analyzes the site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the activity is minimal and cumulative impacts unchanged from those analyzed in the RMP.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the decision that is being implemented went through extensive public participation and review during the Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership input on the Las Cienegas RMP/ROD..

E. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

- 1). All personnel installing utility lines at the Narrows or performing maintenance at creek crossings will be informed of the potential presence of Chiricahua leopard frogs, desert pupfish, Gila chub, and/or Gila topminnow, the status of each species, and the need to perform their duties to avoid impacts to the species and their habitats. (TC01)
- 2) Cultural clearances will be completed at least two weeks prior to any ground disturbing portions of this restoration project, and any cultural sites or resources will be avoided as recommended by the Archaeologist.
- 3) Any work with heavy equipment or volunteer groups will not occur in riparian areas with suitable willow flycatcher habitat during the breeding season of May-July.
- 4) Outreach: A notice of implementation of upcoming road designation changes (motorized to non-motorized) will be posted at the two visitor kiosks and where appropriate at the road segments to be converted.

CONCLUSION

- ☐ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

Cindy Alvarez, Acting Field Manager

Date

DECISION:

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed action is either (a) in conformance with or (b) clearly consistent with terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required. It is my Decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified below.

Mitigation measures or other remarks:

- 1). All personnel installing utility lines at the Narrows or performing maintenance at creek crossings will be informed of the potential presence of Chiricahua leopard frogs, desert pupfish, Gila chub, and/or Gila topminnow, the status of each species, and the need to perform their duties to avoid impacts to the species and their habitats. (TC01)
- 2) Cultural clearances will be completed at least two weeks prior to any ground disturbing portions of this restoration project, and any cultural sites or resources will be avoided as recommended by the Archaeologist.
- 3) Any work with heavy equipment or volunteer groups will not occur in riparian areas with suitable willow flycatcher habitat during the breeding season of May-July.
- 4) Outreach: A notice of implementation of upcoming road designation changes (motorized to non-motorized) will be posted at the two visitor kiosks and where appropriate at the road segments to be converted

Cindy Alvarez, Acting Field Manager

Date